

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-26 are cancelled.

Claims 27-31 and 37-41 are allowed.

Claims 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,539,621 (*Currier*).

**Summary of Response to Office Action**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement that claims 27-31 and 37-41 are allowable. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 32-36 in view of the following comments. Accordingly, claims 27- 41 are presently pending.

**Claims 32-36 Are Allowable Over the Prior Art**

Using *Currier* to reject claims 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Office Action at pages 2 and 3 equates the "electrically-conductive grid having interconnecting rows and columns that define openings therebetween" recited in claim 32 with the carrier contacts 28 disclosed in *Currier*, and the "electrically-conductive paths extending from an exterior surface of the floor, wherein at least some of the paths are provided through the openings of the electrically-conductive grid" further recited in claim 32 with the pin portions 30 of the carrier contacts 28 of *Currier*. Applicants disagree, and traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

*Currier* does not disclose a grid. Instead, *Currier* relates to a dual-in-line package carrier and assembly, *Currier* 1:8-10. *Currier* discloses that "the present invention provides at least two substantially parallel rows of extending electrical projections, preferably corresponding to the extending pin portions 30 of the carrier contacts 28."

*Currier* 5:57-60. *Currier* fails to disclose an electrically conductive grid having “interconnecting rows and columns.” Moreover, even if the carrier contacts were a grid, which they are not, the contacts do not “define openings therebetween.”

Further, since *Currier* fails to disclose openings defined by “interconnecting rows and columns,” *Currier* necessarily fails to disclose electrically conductive paths “provided through the openings of the electrically-conductive grid” Accordingly, Applicants assert that since *Currier* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 32, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 33-36 are allowable at least because of their dependency from independent claim 32, and the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at 202.739.5418 to expedite prosecution.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.36(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:



John D. Zele  
Reg. No. 39,887

Dated: January 23, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Phone: 202.739.3000  
Facsimile: 202.739.3001